

REMARKS

This is in supplement to the after final amendment that was entered upon filing of the RCE (filed July 11, 2003). This supplemental amendment makes minor changes in claim 23 and adds new claims 24 – 33. These new claims find full support in the originally filed specification and drawings and are patentable over the art in that they call for structure which is neither disclosed nor obvious in light of the art of record.

Merely by way of example, the newly presented claims distinguish over the arrangement disclosed in Panzica et al. (USP 5,057,128) in that they call for gas inlet and exhaust ports to be formed in the axial ends of the gas separator housing. The gas flow which is subject to separation in Panzica is introduced radially with respect to the rotating body of absorption elements and is permitted to pass through the outer peripheral surfaces of the absorption elements. In the newly presented claims the passageway(s) for gas which undergoes separation pass through openings in axial faces of the fan-shaped blocks. The claims also make it clear that the temperature adjusting fluid(s) do not pass through the interior of the fan-shaped blocks in which the gas absorbing/releasing material is disposed. This distinguishes over the Panzica arrangement, wherein the interior of the absorption elements are flushed out using the regenerative gaseous stream and the cooling stream (see column 4, lines 13 – 28 and Fig. 4 for example).

These claims also distinguish over the arrangement disclosed in the Chang et al. reference, which does not show a housing per se and which teaches the use of what must be assumed to be an unitary perforate cylindrical member made of metal or ceramic. This suggests a structure which is the opposite of that composed of individual blocks or elements. Chang et al. must therefore be taken as effectively teaching away from the claimed body formed of blocks.

Further, the Chang et al. reference is directed to a dehumidification arrangement which uses vertical passages in a heat exchange relationship with

horizontal passages (column 1, lines 13 – 23). Interestingly, Chang discloses that after dehumidification, the air is again deliberately humidified (see column 3, lines 46 – 53) for cooling purposes.

It is submitted that the hypothetical person of ordinary skill would not be inclined to transfer to Chang et al., any teachings relating to the housing of Panzica et al., for at least the reason that, in Panzica et al., the incoming gas flow is directed against the radially outer surface of the rotating drum, while in Chang et al. the very reverse is the case. Dehumidified air is directed radially away from the rotating cylindrical element used to achieve the separation. Thus, the housing of Panzica et al. would not be suitable as is and would require modification if it were to be applied to the arrangement disclosed in Chang et al. No teachings enabling this modification and/or motivating the hypothetical person of ordinary skill to even consider such a transfer are available in the references.

Further, it is impermissible to simply look to a secondary reference for a single element and to take this element out of context with all of the remaining disclosure and features which are set forth in the disclosure.

Favorable consideration of the newly presented claims along with those entered/amended in the after final response is courteously solicited.

Date July 24, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER
Customer Number: 22428



22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (202) 672-5327

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Keith J. Townsend
Registration No. 40,358